
M I N U T E S

BOARD: HISTORIC CONSERVATION COMMISSION, CITY OF BETHLEHEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH CORNISH, CRAIG EVANS, ROGER HUDAK, GARY LADER, MICHAEL SIMONSON, BETH STARBUCK

MEMBERS ABSENT: KENNETH LOUSH, ANTHONY SILVOY

STAFF PRESENT: KELLEY ANDRADE, DARLENE HELLER, JEFFREY LONG, ALICIA MILLER KARNER, CRAIG PEIFFER

PRESS PRESENT: ED COURRIER

VISITORS PRESENT: ANN CARPENTER, KIM CARRELL-SMITH, JORDAN CLARK, LEO DEVITO, EMILY FOLENTA, ED GALLAGHER, BREENA HOLLAND, JOHN LEE, RACHEL LEON, HOWARD LIEBERMAN, RAFAEL PALOMINO, DOUG ROYSDEN, GREG SALOMONI, JAMES SCHANTZ, ANNA SMITH, CHRISTINA TATU, AL WIRTH

MEETING DATE: APRIL 26, 2021

An additional meeting of the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) was held on April 26, 2021, at the City of Bethlehem Rotunda, Bethlehem City Hall, 10 East Church Street, Bethlehem, PA as well as via GoToMeeting virtual meeting platform. HCC Chair Gary Lader called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item #1

Property Location: 317, 319, 321, 323, 325, 327 South New Street

Property Owner: 325 South New Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Rafael Palomino and Jeffrey Quinn

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: A building was never constructed at 317 South New Street, which currently serves as vehicular and pedestrian access to a collection of rear additions and parking spaces within the interior of this city block.

The structure at 319 South New Street is a single-story, semi-detached commercial wood-framed building with a flat roof. The building dates from ca. 1900; however, many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be assigned a defining style. An ornamental cornice at the main (west) façade has been covered over by a steep shed roof with asphalt shingles. The remaining front façade as well as side and rear façades are painted beige. The storefront includes a large double shop window with upper divides set in wood frames, a paneled and glazed entrance door and a retractable awning.

The structure at 321-323 South New Street is a 3-story, 4-bay attached, commercial and residential brick masonry building with a flat roof, ornamental upper cornice, decorative window heads and altered storefronts. The building dates from ca. 1885 and is Italianate in style. The original brick façade is painted beige while the two storefronts include large, divided glass display windows set in aluminum frames, recessed entrances and retractable awnings. The property also includes a series of two-story and single-story rear additions, several dating from the early 20th century, as evidenced by segmental brick arched window and door openings.

The structure at 325 South New Street is a 3-story, 3-bay attached, commercial and residential brick masonry building with a flat roof and altered storefront. Like the adjacent structure, this building dates from ca. 1885 and was probably Italianate in style; however, the exposed front façade was treated with a stucco veneer and given an etched pattern (often referred to as "Brickote") in imitation red brick sometime during the mid-20th century. The storefront was probably altered at the same time, resulting in one set of steps leading up double doors into a commercial space and flanked on either side by small shop windows while

another set of steps lead up to a single door that services residential units at upper floor levels. A shed roof with asphalt shingles delineates the entry level from upper floor levels and includes a retractable awning. The remaining visible side façade and the rear façade have been covered in yellow stucco with a textured surface. Original architectural features were lost during façade renovations so it can no longer be assigned a defining style. The entire structure seems to be vacant.

The structure at 327 South New Street is a single-story, attached commercial wood-framed building with a flat roof and includes a large, single-story masonry rear addition with a flat roof. The main building dates from ca. 1900, as does the rear addition; however, many architectural features have been lost over time so it can no longer be assigned a defining style. An ornamental upper cornice at the main (west) façade remains visible and is painted deep red while the upper façade has been covered over and painted bright white. The remaining front façade is painted deep red while the rear façade has been covered in yellow stucco with a textured surface. The storefront includes an off-center paneled and glazed entrance door, a large shop window set in wood frames, two smaller shop windows set in aluminum frames and a retractable awning.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to demolish four buildings to construct a multi-story, mixed-use building.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 2.** -- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 5.** -- Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 6.** -- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- It is the purpose and intent of the City of Bethlehem to promote, protect, enhance and preserve historic resources and traditional community character for the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the public through the preservation, protection and regulation of buildings and areas of historic interest or importance within the City.
- **Historical Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- HCC will not recommend approval for demolition unless proposed demolition involves a non-significant building, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant.
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines concerning New Construction** -- including but not limited to following: Size, Scale, Proportion; Rhythm and Patterns; Window and Door Openings; Materials and Textures; Architectural Details; Shape and Massing; Streetscapes.

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meeting on January 25, 2021, Applicant contended that all four existing structures at proposed project location have exceeded anticipated lifespans and exhibit code-compliance, life-safety as well as environmental issues that preclude viability. Applicant justified 12-story height of proposed replacement structure with desire to maximize development allowed by zoning ordinance (150-foot height limitation) and explained that style and architectural details of demolished structures inspire portions of proposed replacement. Applicant summarized various amenities as justification for maximum development to financially support new project: food-court for entry-level commercial space; rooftop terrace available to tenants and general public; 80+

upper-level apartments, including 1-bedroom/1-bathroom and 2-bedroom/2-bathroom units; affordable housing component. Applicant also described architectural features and materials in deference to design guidelines for new construction within Historic Conservation District (HCD). In response to Applicant's presentation, HCC commended overall design as attractive; however, proposal to replace existing one- and three-story structures with one 12-story building was deemed by HCC as inappropriate and incompatible with relevant design guidelines. HCC sympathized with Applicant's desire to maximize allowed development and admitted that proposal would result in positive economics for developer while encouraging economic activity at project location; however, members also noted that HCC is not charged with encouraging economic development but rather with preserving and rehabilitating contributing historical structures within HCD. Applicant was encouraged to explore integration of one or more existing buildings into overall design proposal ... especially contributing Italianate structure located at 321-323 South New Street. Several HCC members noted that development projects taller than five stories are inappropriate for current location as well as for overall HCD; Applicant was encouraged to consider development options beyond HCD if still intent on high-rise construction.

Applicant returned to HCC on February 22, 2021 with COA Application to demolish existing structures at 319, 325 and 327 South New Street while integrating rehabilitated front façade of contributing structure at 321-323 South New Street into overall development project. Design also incorporated dominant cornice height of existing streetscape at third-floor level façades; however, revised proposal rose another ten stories, resulting in 13-story building that significantly digressed from roof heights of adjacent buildings and represented increase of one floor level to previous 12-story building. HCC expressed appreciation for Applicant's integration of front façade of contributing structure within design and noted design approach was successful at street level; however, impact of proposed high-rise building on overall HCD was of great concern to HCC. Similar sentiments were expressed by ten individuals during Public Commentary portion of meeting, with no public support voiced for proposed building height. Upon motion by Mr. Evans and seconded by Ms. Starbuck, HCC adopted proposal 6-0-1, with abstention by Mr. Loush, that City Council DENY Certificate of Appropriateness for proposal to demolish three buildings, to rehabilitate existing façade of one contributing building and to construct multi-story mixed-use building. Those voting in support of denying recommendation to issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposal expressed support for developing project location, including potential demolition of select non-contributing existing structures; however, proposal to replace existing 1-story and 3-story buildings with new 12-story or 13-story structure was determined as inappropriate for existing streetscape and for overall HCD based upon its failure to comply with: Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with the ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of the Historic Conservation District, Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning Demolition as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction.

Applicant petitioned for removal of HCC Motion to DENY recommendation to issue COA from subsequent Bethlehem City Council meeting agenda in order to amend design proposal and re-submit for further HCC assessment. Current COA Application represents Applicant's response to previous HCC discussions and resulting denial. Accompanying cover letter dated April 1, 2021 indicates intent to demolish four existing structures located at 319-327 South New Street, rehabilitate existing Italianate front façade at 321-323 South New Street as well as develop adjacent alley located at 317 South New Street and replace with new 10-story commercial and residential building. Accompanying engineering report completed by Bällina Group bases recommendation for demolition of all existing structures on "Life Safety & Code Compliance" issues as well as "Environmental Concerns" observed during visual property inspection conducted on August 11, 2020. Cover letter as well as accompanying architectural renderings and drawing sheets describe proposed replacement structure as 10-story, mixed-use building that measures approx. 110-feet wide, approx. 75-feet deep and approx. 104-feet high (excluding mechanical penthouse). Proposed entry level includes 6,500 SF of commercial and community spaces while proposed upper floor levels include 8,000 SF each, with mix of one-bedroom/one-bath and two-bedroom/two-bath apartments totaling 65 units. Roof landscapes include rooftop terrace and mechanical penthouse.

Assessment and recommendations for approval should focus on three main concepts: proposed demolition of four existing structures; size and scale of proposed development project; proposed new construction, with storefronts at street level and traditional façade treatments for upper floors.

Demolition: Design guidelines concerning requests for demolition note HCC encourages Applicant to “evaluate significance of buildings within historic district” and “all attempts to reuse historical buildings are exhausted prior to considering demolition”. Guidelines continue that HCC will not adopt motion in support of demolition unless “proposed demolition involves non-significant buildings or building additions, provided demolition will not adversely affect parts of the site or adjacent properties that are significant” or when “Applicant has demonstrated they have exhausted all other options and will suffer undo economic hardship”. Strictly interpreted, all four existing buildings qualify as “contributing structures” to HCD because they were built during district’s period of interpretation (1885-1950). Structures at 319, 325 and 327 South New Street have been significantly compromised over time so all three can no longer be assigned architectural styles. As single-story structures, 319 and 327 South New Street also do not conform to typical 2-, 3- and 4-stories of contributing structures within district; rather, both are perceived as appendages or infill to adjacent structures. However, structure at 321-323 South New Street does exhibit typical size, scale and proportion as well as window openings of district’s mixed-use buildings and retains original architectural detailing; thus, it continues to serve as contributing structure within HCD. Based upon relevant design guidelines, proposal to demolish structures at 319, 325 and 327 South New Street is conceivable and remains part of development proposal. As previously encouraged by HCC, rehabilitated front façade of existing structure at 321-323 South New Street is now integrated into overall development project and is appropriate.

Size and Scale: Should HCC approve proposed demolition, requests are predicated on Applicant’s ability to replace lost buildings with proposal that satisfies Design Guidelines for New Construction within HCD. Relevant guidelines note “new construction should reflect the dominant cornice and roof heights of adjacent buildings and proportions of building elements to one another and the streetscape” and continue “In South Bethlehem, where two-, three- (and four-)story buildings are the norm, buildings that digress from these standards by any great degree seriously impact the Historic Conservation District. If large-scale construction is considered, particular attention will be given to ... the effect of the proposed building on the streetscape and the (District) as a whole.” Current design proposal addresses existing dominant cornice heights by incorporating such details at third-floor level of various façades; however, revised design rises another seven stories, resulting in 10-story building ... which significantly digresses from roof heights of adjacent buildings and represents decrease of only three floor levels from previous 13-story building. Previous COA Applications included several computer-generated views looking south that referenced Fred B. Rooney Building as part of existing streetscape. HCC cautioned Applicant from only referencing nearby non-contributing structures and requested similar views looking north that depict proposed development project in relation to adjacent Greenway and neighboring smaller-scale structures. Provided “Streetview Looking North” on Drawing Sheet A-803 (upper left) satisfies that request but does not depict top of proposed building so proportional relationship with neighboring context is difficult to discern. Greenway is located due south and downhill from proposed 10-story development project so resulting shadow lines would extend well beyond width of Greenway during much of the day. While current design approach might succeed at street level, broader issue is impact of proposed high-rise building on HCD. Based upon relevant design guidelines, current proposal for 10-story structure is inappropriate for immediate streetscape and more generally for overall district.

New Construction: Design guidelines continue by referencing such important issues as: Rhythm and Patterns, Window and Door Openings, Materials and Textures, Architectural Details, Shape and Massing as well as Streetscapes. Proposed floor heights of lowest levels match those of neighboring buildings while intermediate cornice emphasizes transition from commercial street level to residential upper floor levels. Though conceived as one structure, building massing shifts in materiality to appear as two buildings that share common party wall. Integration of existing façade at 321-323 South New Street is reflected within provided drawings; however, relationship of that structure to proposed upper floor levels (ex.: alignment of window bays, window types, etc.) is lacking and warrants further development. Architectural features include double-hung windows, casement windows, cast sills and lintels as well as expressed cornices; proposed façade materials identified on architectural drawings consist of “natural stone veneer”, “synthetic brick veneer” and “synthetic stone veneer”; term “synthetic veneer” is not identified within relevant Design Guidelines as appropriate within HCD. Outer wall condition of upper floor levels seems to cantilever out over support columns at northwest corner (best illustrated on Drawing Sheet A-202, Drawing 1: West Elevation) and warrants clarification before appropriateness can be determined; columns might need to be

exaggerated beyond minimal size requirement to compensate. Subsequent reviews with HCC should address such details as proposed window and door types, cast sills and lintels, cornice profiles and materials along with handrail at roof terraces and lighting fixtures. For on-going project development, Applicant should note that tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate within HCD while appropriate window lite divisions are never wider in dimension than in height so many current windows are inappropriate. Applicant should reference 'Guidelines for Storefronts' before finalizing details of proposed storefronts. Similarly, Applicant should reference 'Guidelines for Signage and Awnings' to conceive overall building signage concept to avoid future tenants from approaching HCC with individual sign proposals and also to create informed designs for awnings at street-level storefronts, noting that current awning depictions with scalloped valances and closed ends are inappropriate.

Discussion: Jordan Clark, Leo DeVito and Rafael Palomino represented proposal to demolish four buildings to construct multi-story, mixed-use building. Mr. Lader appreciated current approach to integrate rehabilitated front façade of contributing historical structure into design but expressed concern that historical façade is not integrated into overall design but rather affixed to new construction ... noting alignment of new structural columns interfere with existing window openings of historical façade. Applicant confirmed effort to remove HCC denial from City Council agenda in order to reconsider design approach based upon previous HCC and public commentary; continued that current design represents reduction in height of 30 feet by reducing number of floor levels from 13 to ten and agreed to investigate alignment of new structural columns in relation to existing historical façade during on-going design development. Applicant noted additional design revisions, including reducing window sizes and improving window alignments on all facades; confirmed all glass is clear and not reflective or tinted.

Mr. Cornish expressed appreciation for overall design approach but repeated previous observation that appropriate building height should be limited to five stories. Mr. Cornish also appreciated Applicant's proposal to rehabilitate existing historical façade but questioned why remaining portions of same contributing structure are not considered for rehabilitation, considering storefronts are currently in use and other portions of building remain habited; continued by noting HCC is commissioned with preserving contributing structures, which reinforces existing rhythm, pattern scale, architectural details, etc. and suggested developer to locate proposed project outside Historic Conservation District. Mr. Evans echoed sentiments by Mr. Cornish concerning size and scale of proposed development project; also expressed concern that provided computer-generated rendering incorrectly depict sunlight patterns and shadows resulting from proposed project, noting inability to correctly replicate sun locations based upon provided submittals. Applicant responded that shadows on renderings were digitally created to enhance certain design features and might not reflect reality. Mr. Evans continued that most portions of South New Street at project location would only experience one hour of sunlight per day, resulting in deep, dark canyon; continued that surrounding/nearby contributing structures represent appropriate scale for historic district while height of current design proposal is not compatible. Like Mr. Cornish, Mr. Evans expressed appreciation for style and details of design proposal but believed it would fit better in different neighborhood.

Mr. Lader questioned proposed hopper-style windows for certain portions of west façade and would appreciate window types consistent with other windows within historical district; also questioned Applicant's choice to transition from dark red brick to orange brick, considering lack of orange brick examples within historic district. Applicant responded that transition of brick color mitigates overall building mass by appearing to be two adjacent structures. Mr. Lader continued by expressing regret at loss of bay windows at west façade with current design, noting previous iteration included bays similar to adjacent structures; Applicant responded that vertical window bays were no longer successful after reducing building height. Mr. Lader continued with major concern remains overall building height; Applicant responded that current design represents minimum number of floor levels of project to remain economically viable. Mr. Hudak repeated previous concern that overall building height is too tall for historic district; also concerned that development above Graham Street (alleyway) represents free development rights from City to developer and would result in darkened tunnel that only encourages nefarious behavior. Mr. Hudak continued that proposed residential units would not address housing needs of typical South Bethlehem residents. Ms. Starbuck agreed with Mr. Hudak's observation that current design represents free development rights for eight floor levels above public street (calculating average square footage rates by number of floor levels over limited time period represents significant rental income garnered from public property); also cited several recent development projects nearby that are limited to four floor levels and have proven successful

so uncertain why current proposal is only possible with ten floor levels. Mr. Simonson noted HCC should not comment on economics of developer's agreement with City to develop air rights; continued by expressing appreciation of current design but does regret Applicant's removal of window bays which recalled adjacent structure and helped mitigate overall building mass. Mr. Simonson expressed concern about certain window types but appreciates rehabilitation of contributing structure façade into design proposal; continued that greatest challenge with current proposal is overall height and massing. Mr. Lader referenced letter of support from Mayor Donchez. Ms. Heller explained she did not intend to read letter into record minutes (letter is rather lengthy); however, Mayor previously expressed support of development project for several key reasons: street level improvements, affordable housing component, overall improvement for South Bethlehem. Ms. Heller noted HCC members received copy of letter, as did Applicant; also noted letter was made public of City's website.

Public Commentary:

Rachel Leon noted irrelevance of design proposal's "beauty" and need for HCC to assess current submittal based on relevant design guidelines; also recalled several recent proposals for high rise construction with strong resistance expressed by South Bethlehem residents during those HCC meetings as well.

Ed Gallagher expressed frustration with inability to locate previous HCC recordings on City's website; Ms. Heller agreed to cooperate with Mr. Gallagher to provide requested recordings. Mr. Gallagher also questioned why HCC must consider projects obviously beyond basic criteria of relevant design guidelines.

Kim Carrell-Smith thanked HCC members and Historic Officer as long-term South Bethlehem resident for clear statements to abide by relevant guidelines; also appreciated rejecting Applicant's claim that Rooney Building represents example to reference as part of current design (that building is non-contributing); continued by appreciating comment that existing contributing historic structure should be rehabilitated (not only front façade); also noted 10-story structure would contradict City's goal to improve walkability of streetscapes; continued by expressing disappointment with Mayor's support of design proposal while it clearly violates City's own design guidelines; also interested in and involved with providing Affordable Housing in South Bethlehem but questioned appropriateness of such housing in 10-story structure when other options are more appropriate; expressed sadness for Applicant if already purchased properties without understanding relevant design guidelines and encouraged Applicant to search elsewhere for appropriate location for design proposal; concluded by expressing concern about growing trend with developers expressing interest in projects that require significant variances to relevant design criteria to make them economically viable.

Breana Holland noted 30-foot reduction in overall building height from previous design approach does not represent significant reduction; repeated previous comment that developers continue to purchase properties and thereafter request variances in violation of design criteria to make them economically viable and suggested City should require developers to sign document upon property purchase that confirms they have read and understand all relevant guidelines. Mr. Cornish explained most developers submit project proposals for review by various City entities prior to actual purchase (often having initiated agreement of sale as equitable owner) with property purchase contingent upon successful completion of various reviews.

Al Wirth shared various concerns expressed by HCC, especially inappropriate size and scale of design proposal in relation to relevant design guidelines; continued that approval of current proposal would encourage series of similar future projects that also require significant variances; continued with concern that City should profit from development (air-) rights above alleyway but also cautioned City against allowing development of those air rights to protect adjacent Greenway ... otherwise proposed project will keep Greenway in constant shadow; summarized mayor's support of development project as being in conflict with City's own goals and represents perfect example of select developers receiving special allowances unavailable to others; noted if HCC approves demolition of existing structures, replacement project should reflect spirit of what was lost and not something completely different; concluded by noting Applicant does not explain how residential component addresses environmental and climate concerns.

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Cornish and seconded by Ms. Starbuck adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to demolish four buildings to construct multi-story, mixed-use building was presented by Jordan Clark, Leo DeVito and Rafael Palomino.

2. Motion to DENY recommendation to issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed development project was unanimously approved; therefore, proposal to secure COA for demolishing four buildings and constructing multi-story, mixed-use building was DENIED. Those voting in support of denying recommendation to issue Certificate of Appropriateness for proposal expressed support for developing project location, including potential demolition of select non-contributing existing structures; however, proposal to replace 1-story and 3-story buildings with 10-story structure was determined to be inappropriate due to proposed demolition of contributing historic structure and also due to negative impact of replacement high rise building on existing streetscape as well as on overall Historic Conservation District based upon its failure to comply with: Secretary of Interior's Standards (SIS) 9. concerning new construction (specifically that new work "will be compatible with historic ... size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect integrity of property and its environment), Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District, Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning Demolition as well as Historic Conservation Commission Design Guidelines concerning New Construction.

The motion for the proposed work was unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #2

Property Location: 215-217 Broadway

Property Owner: Greg Salomoni

Applicant: John Lee

Building Description, Period, Style, and Defining Features: This structure is a 2 ½ story, brick masonry, semi-detached former residential building that was modified in the early 20th century with a commercial storefront. The 2-story, 2-bay storefront includes a brick parapet above a cast stone projecting cornice with simple profiling, 2 pairs of 1-over-1 double-hung windows with large cast stone headers separated from the cornice by soldier coursing, a large display window under a profiled cast stone cornice and a door with transom on either side of the display window. The building dates from the late 19th century and the storefront dates from ca. 1920. The storefront is Classical Revival in style typical of residential/commercial conversions elsewhere in the Historic Conservation District.

Proposed Alterations: It is proposed to construct a new 25-feet x 107-feet addition. A partial addition structure will be demolished including the foundation.

Guideline Citations:

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SIS) 9.** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03 Purposes of Historic Conservation District** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historical Conservation Commission 'Design Guidelines' concerning demolition** -- see Agenda Item #1
- **Historic Conservation District Design Guidelines concerning New Construction** -- see Agenda Item #1

Evaluation, Effect on Historic Conservation District, Recommendations: During HCC meeting on September 18, 2017, Applicant received approval to fully demolish existing building at 215 Broadway with specific conditions, including:

- scaled drawings must be created to document existing cast stone architectural elements in case they cannot be salvaged
- all cast stone or stone architectural elements and as much historical brick as possible will be salvaged and reused in new façades
- new front and side façades will match drawings, as submitted and amended during May 2017 HCC meeting
- new foundation plans for building must be submitted prior to demolition
- Applicant must return to HCC with revised façade drawings for proposed replacement building

Copy of resulting COA with above-referenced conditions is included with current COA Application; however, project records indicate series of reviews earlier in 2017 that also resulted in HCC motion in support of COA during meeting on May 15, 2017 with series of additional conditions, including:

Front façade

- added brick wall match existing and entire façade to be repointed with appropriate mortar matching existing in color, texture, joint style and softness
- top of raised façade (parapet) must be kept below decorative detailing of adjacent firehouse
- there will be single entrance on left side of storefront; new door and transom to match those on adjacent firehouse
- large bi-folding doors will replace former display window and secondary entrance, with two panels on each side of vertical divide and each panel divided into five lites
- windows at second floor to be altered to accommodate outdoor dining terrace; aluminum frames will extend around window openings and divide opening in half ... both vertically and horizontally to create two pairs of “windows”, with lower “sash” infilled with 2-inch x2-inch wire mesh, orthogonally oriented
- storefront surround to be refinished in either tile or blackened steel, with final selection reviewed by HCC at future meeting
- front landing and railing to match at adjacent firehouse
- new signage to be centered above bi-fold doors; design of sign to be reviewed by HCC at future meeting

Side (east) Façade

- façade will be brick for approx. 25-feet from front corner
- two upper-level window openings similar to front façade will be installed; wire mesh will infill lower “sashes” in both openings; cast stone or concrete headers, sills and cap will be installed on brick section of side façade
- no other door or window openings will be created at side façade
- remainder of side façade and rear façade will be finished in sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic top coat and integral color; samples of stucco to be reviewed by HCC at future meeting ... noting no Styrofoam (EIFS) substrate on stucco walls
- wood emergency stair to be installed at rear

At that time, Applicant envisioned reconstruction to serve as addition to adjacent structure, with interior openings to allow for circulation between buildings. Current COA Application does not include required scale floor plan drawings, rear façade drawing or site plan; however, accompanying cover letter dated March 24, 2021 no longer mentions internal connection with adjacent structure.

Although incomplete, current COA Application provides indication of Applicant’s intentions which satisfy select items from previous COAs, including:

Front façade

- cast stone or stone architectural elements are to be salvaged and reused
- as much historical brick as possible to be salvaged and reused in new façade; **note:** added brick should match existing and entire façade pointed with appropriate mortar matching existing in color, texture, joint style and softness
- top of raised façade (parapet) is below decorative detailing of adjacent firehouse
- single entrance on left side of storefront; new door and transom match those on adjacent firehouse
- large bi-folding doors replace former display window and secondary entrance; two panels on each side of vertical divide, with each panel divided into five lites. **note:** tinted or reflective glass is inappropriate
- windows at second floor accommodate outdoor dining terrace, with lower “sash” infilled with 2-inch x2-inch wire mesh, orthogonally oriented; **note:** aluminum frames around window openings that

also divide each opening vertically to create two pairs of “windows” (as previously required) are missing so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined

- front landing and railing match adjacent firehouse
- **note:** series of new single-story and double-story additions that also include additional window openings to east façade were previously not depicted and extend into current adjacent parking lot; clarification is warranted before appropriateness can be determined

Side (east) Façade

- most of façade extending 25-feet from corner is no longer brick, as originally determined as appropriate; discussion is warranted
- two upper-level window openings similar to front façade are indicated within brick portion; wire mesh infill lower “sashes” in both openings; cast stone or concrete sills and cap to be installed on brick section of side façade but cast lintels above windows are not indicated, as originally considered appropriate; openings also should include aluminum frames and be divided vertically to create two “pairs” of windows at each opening
- current drawing depicts faceted sheathing for roof and façade sheathing for single-story and double-story additions near front; material is not identified so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined
- current drawing depicts two additional windows as “thermally broken aluminum frame with insulated glazing”; however, previous COA indicated no other door or window openings will be created at side façade so discussion is warranted
- previous reviews offered no indication of visible roof landscape so proposal for visible EPDM rubber roof membrane warrants discussion
- remainder of side façade and rear façade seems to be finished in sand-smooth cement-based stucco with acrylic top coat and integral color; drawing does not identify proposed façade finish and no drawing of rear façade is provided so discussion is warranted before appropriateness can be determined ... noting Applicant previous agreed to submit product samples for final approval prior to construction
- current Side Elevation drawing depicts metal stair at side facade while previous COA approved wood emergency stair at rear facade; Front Elevation drawing does not indicate proposed stair but would indeed be visible from front as well, which is inappropriate

Supplemental computer-generated view also indicates new signage, exterior lighting and privacy fence extending from corner of front façade; however, current COA Application provides no specifics so such topics should be assessed during subsequent HCC meeting.

Discussion: John Lee and Greg Salomoni represented proposal to construct new 25-foot x 107-foot addition; partial addition structure will be demolished, including foundation. Based upon conditions of previous COAs (May and September of 2017) Applicant assumed current discussion would be restricted relates to required foundation plan and elevation drawings so uncertain about need for floor plan drawings, site plan, etc.; encouraged HCC to focus on provided foundation plan and computer-generated view of proposed project in order to approve proposal to fully demolish existing building. Mr. Lader inquired about previous COA condition to integrate bricks and cast elements salvaged from existing front façade; Applicant responded with intent to integrate salvaged elements into reconstructed façade. Mr. Lader continued that HCC typically requires complete understanding of proposed project (evidenced by scale drawings of all facades, floor plans, site plan, demolition plans, etc.) before requests to demolish contributing structures can be approved. Applicant responded that everything to right (northeast) of existing firehouse is proposed for demolition, noting previous explanation to HCC that existing foundations are in poor condition (select footings are even missing) so new foundation is needed to support proposed construction; continued that proposed design represents same proposal presented to HCC during meeting on Sept. 18, 2017 and approved at that time. Ms. Starbuck explained current need for HCC to understand overall project in more detail, considering time lapse since project was last considered and noted that composition of HCC has also changed; continued by recalling initial exploration of project site indicated that existing foundations did not align with exterior walls above so HCC requested submission of foundation plan that relates to full

building replacement. Ms. Starbuck continued that computer-generated image of proposed façade seems vaguely familiar but could not recall determination by HCC that proposal was appropriate; Mr. Long confirmed that no resulting motion by HCC in support of design proposal could be found within City's database of COAs. Applicant responded that plan reviews of design proposal by various City entities are currently on-going; Ms. Starbuck explained design projects should be fully developed before HCC can approve requests for demolition of contributing structures. Mr. Simonson confirmed that Applicant's current plan reviews (including request for demolition permit) triggered need to submit foundation plan to HCC in satisfaction of previous COA condition; Ms. Starbuck requested that Mr. Simonson cooperate directly with Applicant to escort project through various reviews. Mr. Simonson continued by noting need for scaled site plan because new addition invades adjacent parking lot. Applicant confirmed adjacent lot will be configured to accommodate new addition while also offering parking; continued that HCC approval of proposed demolition is important for on-going negotiations with Bethlehem Parking Authority.

Mr. Evans explained that intent of HCC with respect to demolition is guarding against taking down contributing buildings without understanding intended replacement. Mr. Evans noted current COA Application provides adequate information about replacement design project but also noted lack of details concerning proposed façade materials; continued by recalling previous experiences with Applicant's promises of needed information that never materialized but assumes information with current submittal satisfies previous COA requirement. Mr. Cornish recalled computer-generated rendering from previous HCC meeting but also recalled personal vote against project proposal as inappropriate ... specifically: issue of front garage doors to match similar at adjacent structure, which were also problematic for HCC and never corrected; continued that current design proposal has not significantly changed and neither has his objection. Ms. Starbuck summarized various needs for clarification, including: proposed façade cladding around front entry-level doors and at select side additions; better understanding of bump out intended for emergency stairs at side façade; status of purchase negotiations with Bethlehem Parking Authority to allow for side additions; need for scale drawings of floor plans, all facades and site plan to better understand design proposal, etc. Applicant responded with desire to secure HCC approval of submitted foundation plan in satisfaction of demolition permit requirement; would then return to HCC with requested details. Ms. Starbuck recommended that HCC table current decision until more details are provided; Applicant responded with preference for permission to demolish, noting on-going negotiations to purchase portions of adjacent parking lot are contingent upon securing demolition approval. Mr. Lader noted that current submittals seem to satisfy remaining conditions of previous COA, including integration of salvaged materials into new design proposal. Mr. Simonson continued that new COA resolution should include notation that all relevant planning applications must be successfully reviewed and approved before demolition permit can be released; also noted that subsequent COA Applications should address appropriateness of various project details.

Public Commentary: none

Motion: HCC upon motion by Mr. Lader and seconded by Ms. Starbuck adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed work as presented, with modifications described as follows:

1. Proposal to construct new 25-foot x 107-foot addition by demolishing partial addition structure including foundation was presented by John Lee and Greg Salomoni.
2. Applicant previously confirmed satisfaction of select conditions identified within COA (Resolution 2017-195, adopted by City Council on October 3, 2017), including:
 - a. scaled drawings to document existing cast stone architectural elements in case any are unable to be salvaged
 - b. all cast stone or stone architectural elements and as much historical brick as possible will be salvaged and reused in new facades
3. Applicant confirmed satisfaction of remaining conditions identified within a COA (Resolution 2017-195, adopted by City Council on October 3, 2017), including:
 - a. submittal of new foundation plan for proposed building prior to demolition
 - b. submittal of revised façade drawings for proposed building

Note: City of Bethlehem will not issue approved demolition permit until all planning applications have been successfully reviewed and Applicant has secured subsequent COA confirming appropriateness of relevant design details.

The motion for proposed work was approved: 5-1. Mr. Cornish opposed the motion, recalling his previous decision that the proposed project is inappropriate, as presented.

There was no further business; HCC meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



BY:

Jeffrey Long
Historic Officer
South Bethlehem Historic Conservation District
Mt. Airy Historic District